

Remarks

Claims 1-20 were pending in the present application, to which claims 21 and 22 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Initially, the examiner is thanked for holding a telephonic interview with the undersigned on June 19, 2006. During the interview the above amendments to claims 1, 10 and 19 were discussed. While no agreement on allowable subject matter was reached, the examiner did indicate that the claims if amended, as presented herein, appeared to distinguish over the prior art relied upon in the outstanding rejection. The following comments are submitted in furtherance of this distinction.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hans Sick in view of Mattos. The undersigned respectfully traverses this rejection.

The prior art fails to teach or suggest a cable have a core comprising at least one twisted pair of insulated wires and a jacket surrounding the core, where the jacket comprises the claimed spline structure. Among other things, the prior art fails to teach or suggest a jacket with at least one spline in contact with a twisted pair to prevent relative movement of the jacket with respect to the twisted pair. As explained during the interview, Hans Sick does not constitute analogous prior art as Hans Sick is unrelated to cabling with twisted pairs. Instead, Hans Sick concerns a process and apparatus for manufacture of a heat-insulated metal pipe.

Also, there is no motivation to locate Mattos' twisted pairs within Hans Sick's metal pipe. A fundamental purpose of Mattos' invention is to provide an ultra thin and flexible SCSI cable (see Mattos' title). Locating Mattos' twisted pairs within Hans Sick's metal pipe would defeat Mattos' purpose and result in a combination that was not "ultra thin" and was not "flexible". There is no showing within the outstanding office action of a reasonable motivation to make the suggested combination and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Further, even if combined, Hans Sick and Mattos fail to render obvious the claimed invention. For example, even if Mattos' twisted pairs were located within Hans Sick's metal

VIA FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION 1-571-273-8300

TYCO 18013 (20958-43)
PATENT

pipe, the combination would not include, nor render obvious, the claimed spline structure. The interior of Hans Sick's metal pipe is smooth and entirely void of splines. Similarly, Mattos' inner shield 106 is also smooth and entirely void of splines. Thus, the combination of Hans Sick and Mattos would similarly lack a jacket with at least one spline in contact with the twisted pair to prevent relative movement of the jacket with respect to the twisted pair.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter. Should anything remain to place the present application in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dean D. Small, Reg. No. 34,730
THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
611 Olive Street, Ste. 1611
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 584-4081